

lodge, joins nostalgic beauty and modern convenience. The spring 1997 edition of "The Route 66 Association of Missouri" features the Rail Haven on its cover and describes the facilities as "a charming 1950's style parlor room, complete with chandeliers, old time radios and speakeasy telephones, or, if you're a business traveler, you can choose to relax in one of the elegant corporate-friendly rooms." Featuring celebrity theme rooms for people like Marilyn Monroe and Elvis Presley, Elliott's Route 66 Rail Haven has found customers enjoying the opportunity to relive a bygone era in accommodations.

The Rail Haven is a Best Western motel. It is one of five motel properties owned by Elliott Lodging. The firm also owns and manages about 2,000 apartment units in Springfield. Gordon Elliott is a former Springfield City Council member and is a CPA in Springfield, MO.

BAN UNSOLICITED JUNK ELECTRONIC MAIL

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1997

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Netizens Protection Act of 1997. My legislation is aimed at protecting the internet user from the unseemly practices of the junk e-mailer. The internet user, or Netizen, is in a vulnerable position in the new medium and we in Congress cannot stand idly by as law-abiding citizens have their privacy invaded on an almost regular basis. And no one should have to pay for any such intrusion.

This is a bill that has moved, as Justin Newton of the Internet Service Provider Consortium so succinctly stated, from the community to the legislature, not one that was produced by the legislature and then forced upon the community. We are empowering the consumer and the individual to take action against an egregious breach of consumer and individual rights.

As increasing numbers of Americans go online and become passengers on the information superhighway, consumers' rights must not be eroded, abridged, or mitigated along the way.

The Internet—and e-mail—are becoming part of our everyday lives. And no one—from the consumer to the small businesses who run servers—should be forced to pay for unsolicited advertisements. This is not a question of curbing speech. I believe in the first amendment as much as anyone else. However, the idea of shifting the financial burden of speech on to an unwilling audience is one that needs to be addressed.

From the netizen who may incur costs in the form of charges spent online reading and disposing of the messages—there are still millions of internet users who pay in increments of time spent online—to users who assume the costs of both accessing and storing mail they did not want, consumers should not be unwilling, and paying, recipients.

Furthermore, junk e-mailers occupy time and space on an Internet Service Provider's ISP servers and forces the ISP to make technical improvements. The cost of these improvements are passed on to the consumer—

you and me. In effect, the consumer is paying to have their privacy breached and invaded.

And no one remains unaffected by these intrusions. The business owner or ISP with their own server often unwittingly distributes unsolicited advertisements by acting as an exploder site or mail relay site. Not only is this trespassing on another person's property, but it is an outright theft of another person's resources.

Even more disturbing is the fact that a large portion of the unsolicited junk e-mail comes in the form of fraudulent get rich quick schemes, unproven medical remedies, and other unsavory solicitations.

Let me reiterate that my legislation is targeted at unsolicited commercial e-mail. The paths of communications between friends and acquaintances and businesses and their customers remains wide open. As a matter of fact, this legislation still offers the opportunity for legitimate direct marketers to do business. Certainly, the traditional avenues of direct marketing which do not shift the burden of cost to the recipient, such as postal mail, remain unchanged; and individuals will have the right to opt-in and be reached by legitimate direct marketers via e-mail. And let us not forget that we will still be exposed to electronic billboard and banner advertising on the Internet.

My legislation will make unsolicited advertisements unlawful by amending the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 which banned unsolicited junk faxes. The banning of junk e-mails is a natural extension of existing law. Based on a Ninth Circuit Court decision in *Destination Ventures v. FCC* (1995), there is substantial Government interest in protecting consumers from having to bear the costs of third-party advertising. In addition, the court also held that advertisers have no right to turn consumers into a "captive audience" that is "incapable of declining to receive a message."

I believe I have crafted a bill—although it is just the beginning of a process which includes hearings and committee work—that is acceptable to most parties involved. It allows people to "opt in" and receive unsolicited advertisements if they give their consent, but it does not put the onus on the individual to stop the unsolicited advertisers as an "opt out" plan would do. Today, at a press conference Ray Everett, a representative of the proconsumer group Coalition Against Unsolicited Commercial E-Mail, and Justin Newton, a representative from the pro-business Internet Service Providers Consortium—each coming at the issue from different sides—both came to the same conclusion—this legislation would be an effective way to put a stop to unsolicited advertisements.

THE SPORTSMEN'S BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1997

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, as vice chairman of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, it is my pleasure to join in introducing the sportsmen's bill of rights in the House of Representatives. Our goal is to assure the same kind of access to Federal public lands and waters for tomorrow's hunters and an-

glers, that present and past generations of hunters and anglers have known.

From a young age, I learned to value and treasure the outdoors. I have also had the enjoyment of passing this love of the outdoors onto my son and hope one day to pass it along to my grandson. I am an original sponsor of the sportsmen's bill of rights because I want to ensure that future generations will not be denied the opportunity to enjoy similar experiences with their families and friends.

Government's involvement with promoting America's outdoor heritage dates back to the days of Teddy Roosevelt, and the sportsmen's bill of rights is a continuation of that relationship. This proconservation and prooutdoorsman legislation will strengthen hunters' and anglers' ability to hunt and fish on Federal public lands, while requiring Federal agencies to defer to State management authorities in most instances. Not only does the legislation encourage local stewardship, but it also maintains all current land management mandates and priorities established by law, so not to disturb current and successful conservation practices.

The primary focus of the sportsmen's bill of rights is to restore equity to public land use by providing reasonable access to America's outdoorsmen and women. In fact, this common-sense measure will give hunters and anglers the ability to utilize public lands that all taxpayers should have the ability to enjoy. After all, it is our tax dollars that pay for the maintenance and upkeep of public lands—with much of that tax revenue being generated from sportsmen's activities. In my home State of Georgia alone, the expenditures of sportsmen account for \$88 million in State and Federal tax revenues.

By passing the sportsmen's bill of rights, Congress can send a message to the American public that the environment is too important to be left to extreme special interest groups or big government bureaucrats. This measure will unlock America's beautiful lands for all to enjoy, whether it is the type of folks who enjoy fishing with their children on a cool Saturday morning or those who can only go out once a year with their old hunting buddies.

SPORTSMEN'S BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1997

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the sportsmen's bill of rights. When this bill becomes law, it will encourage Federal land managing agencies to allow hunting and fishing on the lands they manage. It requires these agencies to take into consideration the impact that their policies and management practices will have on hunting and fishing. Another important feature of this bill clarifies that State government holds the primary management authority over wildlife resources unless the Federal managing agency can show specific statutory authority that requires otherwise.

This legislation is needed to ensure that Americans who enjoy the outdoors can utilize our public lands. There have been too many instances where Federal agencies have closed lands to hunting and fishing with little to